

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of June 25, 2004, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. The specification has been amended to include related case information as application serial numbers instead of attorney docket numbers. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claims 24-40 have been added. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, and 19-23 have been amended. Claims 1 and 3-40 are thus now pending in the application, and reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jonsson *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,513,246, hereinafter Jonsson). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “switching reception from said first wireless transmitter to said synchronized second wireless transmitter after a first DVB service signal transmission burst has been received, and prior to receipt of a consecutive DVB service signal transmission burst transmitted by the second wireless transmitter.” Jonsson neither teaches nor suggests DVB broadcasting, synchronized transmitters, nor switching reception from a first wireless transmitter to a second wireless transmitter during an interval between two consecutive transmission bursts. Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by Jonsson.

Claim 6 is dependent on amended independent claim 1 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 6 has been amended to be consistent with amendments made to claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Ahopelto *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,970,059, hereinafter Ahopelto). Claim 3 has been amended to coincide with amendments made to claim 1. Claim 3 is dependent on amended independent claim 1 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. In addition, Ahopelto does not cure the deficiencies of Jonsson.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Ahopelto and further in view of Bahr *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,601,586, hereinafter Bahr). Claim 5 has been amended to be consistent with amendments made to claim 1. Claims 4 and 5 depend back to amended independent claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. In addition, neither Ahopelto nor Bahr cure the deficiencies of Jonsson.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Nguyen. Claims 7-8 have been amended to be consistent with amendments made to claim 1. Claims 7 and 8 are dependent back to amended independent claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. In addition, Nguyen does not cure the deficiencies of Jonsson.

Claims 9, 11-16, 18, 21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Mäkinen (U.S. Pat. No. 5,764,700, hereinafter Mäkinen). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Amended claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, “means for switching reception from the first wireless transmitter to a second wireless transmitter synchronized with the first wireless transmitter, after reception of said first transmission burst has been completed and prior to a consecutive transmission burst transmitted by the second wireless transmitter.” As discussed above, Jonsson neither teaches nor suggests synchronized transmitters nor switching reception from a first transmitter to second transmitter in the time interval between two synchronized consecutive transmission bursts. Also, Mäkinen does not cure the deficiencies of Jonsson. Claims 11-15 are dependent on amended independent claim 9, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 9.

Independent claim 16 recites, *inter alia*, “a first transmitter for broadcasting at least an interval of information as a transmission burst in synchronization with at least one other transmitter.” As discussed above, Jonsson neither teaches nor suggests synchronized transmission from multiple transmitters. Instead, Jonsson describes a conventional cellular

radiotelephone system whereby a radiotelephone communicates with one base station at a time. While the cellular phone is receiving information from that one base station, other base stations are not synchronously transmitting the same information, as is done by the claimed invention. Mäkinen does not cure the deficiencies of Jonsson, and so claim 16 is allowable over Jonsson in view of Mäkinen. Claim 18 is dependent on claim 16 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

Amended independent claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, “selecting a first synchronized wireless transmitter from a plurality of synchronized wireless transmitters for providing information, each said synchronized wireless transmitter broadcasting on a different frequency.” As discussed above, neither Jonsson nor Mäkinen teach or suggest synchronized transmission, and therefore claim 21 is allowable over Jonsson in view of Mäkinen. Claim 23 is dependent on claim 21, and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Claims 10, 19-20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Mäkinen and further in view of Nguyen. Claims 19 and 20 have been amended to provide correct antecedent basis. This rejection is respectfully traversed because each of claims 10, 19-20 and 22 is allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims in view of the fact that Nguyen does not cure the deficiencies of Jonsson and Mäkinen.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Mäkinen and further in view of Doshi *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,936,965, hereinafter Doshi). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. Claim 17 is dependent on allowable claim 16, and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 16. In addition, Doshi describes a method an apparatus supporting the transmission of multiple application layer protocols multiplexed over a *single bytestream for transmission over a single link*. Doshi, col. 2, lines 5-8. The invention of claim 17, however, recites (in base claim 16) “a first transmitter for broadcasting at least an interval of information as a transmission burst in synchronization with at least one other transmitter.” Doshi only describes a single transmitter, and therefore claim 17 is further allowable because Doshi does not cure the deficiencies of Jonsson and Mäkinen.

Appln. No.: 10/085,910
Amendment dated August 31, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 25, 2004

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 24-40 in order to more broadly claim aspects of their invention. No new matter has been added.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 31st day of August, 2004

By:



Ross Dannenberg, Registration No. 49,024

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001
RAD/mmd